



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/044,901	01/10/2002	Rory A.J. Curtis	MPI01-010P1RNM	1217
30405	7590	09/13/2005	EXAMINER	
MILLENNIUM PHARMACEUTICALS, INC. 40 Landsdowne Street CAMBRIDGE, MA 02139			WEGERT, SANDRA L	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		1647		

DATE MAILED: 09/13/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/044,901	CURTIS, RORY A.J.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Sandra Wegert	1647

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 May 2002.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-33 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) 1-33 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

Election/Restrictions

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claims 1-11, 23 and 29, drawn to nucleic acids, complimentary nucleic acids, recombinant methods of producing polypeptides and host cells comprising nucleic acids; classified in class 435, subclass 69.1+.
- II. Claims 12-18, drawn to a 58297 polypeptide; classified in class 530, subclass 350+.
- III. Claim 19-22 and 26, drawn to antibodies immunospecific for the 58297 polypeptide; classified in class 424, subclass 130.1+.
- IV. Claims 24 and 25, drawn to a method for detecting the presence of a 58297 polypeptide using a ligand or antibody; classified in class 435, subclass 7.1+.
- V. Claim 26, drawn to a kit comprising a compound that binds the 58297 polypeptide; classification dependent on structure of ligand.
- VI. Claims 27 and 28, drawn to a method for detecting the presence of a nucleic acid using a hybridizing nucleic acid; classified in class 536, subclass 24.3+.
- VII. Claims 30, 31 and 33, drawn to a method for identifying a compound which binds the 58297 polypeptide; classified in class 435, subclass 7.1+.
- VIII. Claim 32, drawn to a method of modulating the activity of the 58297 polypeptide by adding a ligand of the polypeptide; classified in class 435, subclass 7.1+.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Although there are no provisions under the section for "Relationship of Inventions" in M.P.E.P. § 806.05 for Inventive Groups that are directed to different products, restriction is deemed to be proper because these products constitute patentably distinct inventions for the following reasons: Groups I-III and V are independent and distinct, each from the other, because they comprise products which possess characteristic differences in structure and function, and each has an independent utility that is distinct for each invention which cannot be exchanged. The nucleic acids of group I can be used to make a hybridization probe or can be used in gene therapy as well as in the production of the protein of interest. The protein of Group II can be used to make an antibody or used therapeutically. The antibodies of Invention III can be used to localize the protein of interest or used to immunoprecipitate the protein. The agonists and antagonists of Invention V can be used for in-situ identification of the polypeptide or can be used for treatment.

Groups I and II are also related as process of making and product made. The Inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make other and materially different product, or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process (MPEP § 806.05 (f)). In the instant case the polypeptide can be prepared by materially different processes, such as by chemical synthesis, or obtained from nature using various isolation and purification protocols.

Furthermore, Invention I is unrelated to Invention III. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together, or they have different modes of operation, or they have different functions, or they have different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP

§ 808.01). In the instant case the polynucleotide is unrelated to the antibody because they are each used for different purposes and neither is produced by use of the other.

Invention I is unrelated to Inventions IV VII and VIII. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together, or they have different modes of operation, or they have different functions, or they have different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the polynucleotide is unrelated to methods that identify or administer a ligand of the 58297 polypeptide.

Invention I is related to invention VI as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05 (h)). In the instant case the polynucleotide of Invention I can be used to produce the 58297 polypeptide as well as for in-situ hybridization techniques in tissue and for administration of DNA for the treatment of disease.

Invention II is related to Inventions IV, VII and VIII as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05 (h)). In the instant case the polypeptide of Invention II can be used to both produce the antibody of Invention III, as well as to search for ligands.

Invention II is unrelated to Invention VI. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together, or they have different modes of operation, or

they have different functions, or they have different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01).

In the instant case the polypeptide of Invention II is neither used in nor produced by any of the methods of Invention VI.

Invention III is related to Inventions IV and possibly VIII as product and process of use.

The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05 (h)). In the instant case the antibody of Invention III can be used both to localize the polypeptide, as well as to immunoprecipitate the protein of interest.

Invention III is unrelated to Inventions VI and VII. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together, or they have different modes of operation, or they have different functions, or they have different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the antibody of Group III is neither used in nor produced by any of the methods or products of Groups VI and VII.

Invention IV is related to Invention V as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05 (h)). In the instant case the ligand of Invention IV can be used both to localize the polypeptide, as well as therapeutically.

The methods of Inventions IV and VI-VIII are independent and distinct, each from the other, because the methods are practiced with materially different process steps for materially different purposes and each method requires a non-coextensive search because of different starting materials, process steps and goals. Methods of detecting a protein are different from methods of detecting ligands for that protein. Methods of adding ligands of 58297 are distinct from methods that utilize DNA because they require different materials, experimental protocols, and personnel, and have different chances of success.

Invention V is unrelated to Inventions VI and VII. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together, or they have different modes of operation, or they have different functions, or they have different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the method Invention VI requires a nucleic acid which would have a different structure from the product of Invention V and would have different cellular and physiological effects. In addition, a labeling compound which binds to the 58297 polypeptide would not bind to a 58297 ligand.

Invention V is related to Invention VIII as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05 (h)). In the instant case the antagonist of Invention V can be used for in situ localization of 58297 as well as to treat a 58297-related disease in a subject.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above, as well as by their different classifications, divergent subject matter and different search requirements, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

In response to this requirement, applicants must elect from Groups I through VIII. Applicant is advised that in order for the reply to this requirement to be complete it must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 C.F.R. 1.143).

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 C.F.R. 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a petition under 37 C.F.R. 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 C.F.R. 1.17(i).

The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and a product claim is subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be rejoined in accordance with the provisions of MPEP § 821.04. **Process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the patentable product will be entered as a matter of right if the amendment is presented prior to final rejection or allowance, whichever is earlier. Amendments submitted after final rejection are governed by 37 CFR 1.116; amendments submitted after allowance are governed by 37 CFR 1.312.**

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined

Art Unit: 1647

claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103, and 112. Until an elected product claim is found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowed product claim will not be rejoined. See “Guidance on Treatment of Product and Process Claims in light of *In re Ochiai, In re Brouwer* and 35 U.S.C. § 103(b),” 1184 O.G. 86 (March 26, 1996). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, Applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution either to maintain dependency on the product claims or to otherwise include the limitations of the product claims. **Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder.**

Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

Advisory information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sandra Wegert whose telephone number is (571) 272-0895. The examiner can normally be reached Monday - Friday from 9:00 AM to 5:00 PM (Eastern Time). If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Brenda Brumback, can be reached at (571) 272-0961.

The fax number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

Art Unit: 1647

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

SLW

5 September 2005



JANET L. ANDRES
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER